EXHIBIT 4

	4
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE
3	
4	TEXTRON INNOVATIONS INC., : Civil Action
5	Plaintiff, :
6	v. :
7	TORO COMPANY,
8	Defendant. : No. 05-486-GMS
9	
10	Wilmington, Delaware Thursday, January 11, 2007
11	9:30 a.m. Telephone Conference
12	rerabuoue courereuce
13	BEFORE: HONORABLE GREGORY M. SLEET, U.S.D.C.J.
14	APPEARANCES:
15	
16	EDMOND D. JOHNSON, ESQ. Pepper Hamilton LLP
17	-and- SCOTT L. ROBERTSON, ESQ. Hunton & Williams
18	(Washington, D.C.)
19	Counsel for Plaintiff
20	RICHARD L. HORWITZ, ESQ., and DAVID E. MOORE, ESQ.
21	Potter Anderson & Corroon, LLP
22	ANTHONY R. ZEULI, ESQ., and THOMAS LEACH, ESQ.
23	Merchant & Gould (Minneapolis, Minnesota)
24	Counsel for Defendant
5	Counsel for Delendant

Then I am turning to Page 25, and I say, "One question and clarification. I was suggesting that Mr. Robertson make available to us the Johnson Creek facility and the Charlotte facility."

б

Your Honor said, "I think he said that he is willing to do that."

On Page 26 finally the Court says, "But I am going to require that you" -- and you are referring to Textron" -- "make every effort to have your client arrange access."

THE COURT: Let's find out from Textron why that hasn't been done.

MR. ROBERTSON: Your Honor, thank you.

It has been done, sir. Let me tell you the efforts that have been made.

Just to refresh the Court, you recall, we no longer control this company. It is now a new company called I think Commercial Grounds Care. It is not under our control. It is not owned by us. What we did shortly after that call is called our point of contact there, a gentleman by the name of Mark Wegner, again, no longer our employee, and said, look, we would like to gain access to this facility to make it available for an inspection.

Your Honor may also recall, we already inspected it and produced responsive documents. But notwithstanding

that, we made that effort.

Shortly thereafter, we understood, or we had learned that Mr. Zeuli had also issued a subpoena to Commercial Grounds Care, the scope of which is breathtaking. Anyway, we contacted Commercial Grounds Care's in-house counsel. The first thing she said, Your Honor, was do not have any further contact with my employees. I am the attorney on this matter. You will deal with me.

My partner, Chris Campbell, has had multiple conversations with her, attempting to try and facility that access.

She is attempting to deal with the subpoena.

And I understand she has had conversations with Mr. Zeuli about the scope and breadth of the subpoena. She secured an extension from Mr. Zeuli, I understand, until January 7.

And in the meantime, she filed objections to the subpoena. She has told us that the subpoena calls virtually for every piece of paper that that company has. I am just stunned at the scope. We have attempted to get in there. In-house counsel told us not to deal with anybody at the company anymore and to deal with her.

We have been dealing with her, and we understood she was responding to the subpoena.

Mr. Zeuli had represented more than a month ago that he would narrow the scope of the subpoena and tell her

exactly what he was looking for. We understand to date he hasn't made any effort to do that.

We are at loggerheads, Your Honor. I can't control access to a company that is not owned by my company.

THE COURT: No, you can't.

MR. ROBERTSON: And we, as I said, Your Honor, made an inspection of that facility ourselves and produced documents. As Your Honor knows, we made the 6,000 files available down in Charlotte for the inspection. The Court at the last hearing urged Mr. Zeuli to press on with that inspection. I can report that the very next day Mr. Zeuli and his team left the facility at 11:00 a.m., didn't complete the inspection, and then when we asked him when he was coming back to complete the inspection, if they would to be back Monday, they said no. Would they be back next week? They said they couldn't tell us.

We told Mr. Zeuli we would complete the inspection for him. I sent a team down that following Monday and searched through the remaining 6,000 documents and produced responsive documents.

Your Honor, I am a little frustrated here in the sense we seem to be doing everything we can in our power to provide documents for these individuals, and all we get is more complaints.

Commercial Grounds Care has a subpoena. They

have objected. If Mr. Zeuli wants to do what he promised to do and narrow the request, then I think he will get responsive documents from it. But at this point it is really out of our control, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Zeuli, I am satisfied that

Textron has done what it can do with regard to the first

bullet point. What efforts are you making to deal with the

new entity, Commercial Grounds, to get your needs met?

MR. ZEULI: Your Honor, could you repeat the last part?

THE COURT: I am asking what additional efforts are you making, I think it was Mr. Johnson?

MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Robertson.

THE COURT: Mr. Robertson reports he believes you to be in contact directly with Commercial Grounds, their attorney, regarding the scope of your subpoena. Are you engaged in ongoing efforts to get your needs met? Because at this point I don't know what else you would have the Court order Textron to do.

MR. ZEULI: I would ask that they comply with the order that Your Honor entered back in November.

THE COURT: How exactly would you have them -- how would you craft that additional relief?

MR. ZEULI: I think what I would have, Your Honor, is that Textron is required to facilitate through

discussions with the in-house counsel at Commercial Grounds

Care an inspection. Mr. Robertson never said, and I don't

believe he ever asked for, the inspection that was

discussed, agreed to and ordered in November.

THE COURT: Is that correct, Mr. Robertson?

MR. ROBERTSON: No, it is not correct, Your

Honor. First, Your Honor, in fact, we have so pestered this in-house counsel, Vickie Waitsman, she said she doesn't want to deal with us anymore. She will only talk to my in-house counsel at Textron.

Just as an aside, but this is very relevant, there has been a dispute going on about the sale and acquisition of that facility between the two companies. So, really, Commercial Grounds Care is not out to do us any real favors, notwithstanding that we have been urging them to make documents available or facilitate the inspection. As I said, my partner, Chris Campbell, has had numerous calls and e-mails with her to the point where she has now said I am not going to deal with you anymore, I will only deal with Textron in-house counsel.

THE COURT: The facility is no longer in the control of the plaintiff.

MR. ROBERTSON: Exactly right.

THE COURT: It was part of a sale.

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, sir.

MR. ZEULI: Your Honor, that sale occurred recently, in August. That was after the discovery was served. That was discussed at length in our November conference.

Similarly, the in-house counsel, after she was contacted by Textron, I believe stopped returning my calls for a month at Commercial Grounds Care.

So at the end of the day, Your Honor, we had resolved this in November, I believe. They never facilitated the inspection or helped us get the documents that are there. Now they are saying, sorry, we can't do anything, it is not in our control anymore.

officer of the Court, Mr. Zeuli, that he did make reasonable efforts -- my word, reasonable -- because they sound like they were reasonable, to comply with the Court's order. What would you have me do? Sanction them? Because right now, as I understand it, he has no standing to ask me to order this third party to do anything. I don't have the power, as I understand the limits of my authority, to do that, do I?

MR. ZEULI: Is there something in the order,
Your Honor, that we can put that will help me in the event
that Commercial Grounds Care says, no, we are not going to
let Toro come in and look at the documents?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: What district is this in, Johnson Creek, North Carolina?

MR. ROBERTSON: It is in Wisconsin, Your Honor.

The subpoena issued, Your Honor, in Pennsylvania I believe, in Pittsburgh. Of course, Mr. Zeuli could always move to compel on the subpoena and a judge with the proper authority could order Commercial Grounds Care to do whatever it thinks is reasonable.

THE COURT: This will end up being a miscellaneous matter on some District Judge's docket who had no idea it was coming. In any event, it would at least be properly within the power of that Court to act constitutionally within the bounds of appropriate discretion. I can't do anything out in Wisconsin, I don't think.

MR. ZEULI: Can you give us some help in this order, in an order, so that when we went into that judge we could say, look, we have an order from the Court in Delaware saying that we should have had access to this earlier and didn't, and therefore it looks --

THE COURT: I don't want to make it seem as if Mr. Robertson and company withheld access. That is not my conclusion. If you and he can agree on some order that you think might help one of my colleagues decide this matter quickly and you can come up with some language that is

satisfactory to both of you, I will sign it. But as you know, it's without any legal -- it is not going to have any legal impact out there in Wisconsin.

MR. ZEULI: Are you agreeable to that, Scott?

MR. ROBERTSON: Your Honor, your order said they are going to require me to make every effort to have your client arrange access to the Johnson Creek facility.

Coupled with that, you said the representation that you searched Johnson Creek yourself pursuant to your obligation under the Federal Rules, that should be adequate.

I have done that, Your Honor. Now there is a process, Mr. Zeuli wants to pursue the subpoena with Commercial Grounds Care, he should go ahead and do that.

THE COURT: I am not ordering you to do anything else, Mr. Robertson. I offered a possible solution to Mr. Zeuli's apparent problem.

I think you need to prosecute a motion to compel in Wisconsin, Mr. Zeuli. I am not going to tell you how to practice law.

MR. ZEULI: I will do that.

THE COURT: Let's go to the second issue.

MR. ZEULI: Similarly, from the November conference call, Your Honor, you had directed Textron to identify the individuals that might have had access to or generated certain prior art.